

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR002/KE

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 15 and 19 are currently being amended. No new matter is added.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-20 remain pending in this application.

In paragraphs 2-5 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 5-8, 10, 12-15, 17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent No. 6,392,695 (Watamoto) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,677,430 (Falkman). The Examiner states:

As to claims 1 and 8, Watamoto teaches a method of reducing luminance decay of emissive elements in a matrix addressed emissive display device . . . , the method comprising :

Generating control data corresponding to a static image to be displayed and generating drive signals as a function of the control data . . . providing the drive signals to the matrix . . . altering the control data . . .

Accordingly, Watamoto teaches all the claim limitations except for substantially continuously move the static image on the matrix in a manner which is substantially undetectable to the viewers of the display device.

However, Falkman discloses the conventional CRT display device that includes the display of stationary image is prevented and the movement of the pattern is sufficiently slow to be imperceptible to the viewer. (col. 1, lines 34-40) . . .

The Examiner also states:

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR002/KE

As to claims 5 and 12, Watamoto teaches . . .

defining an image origin of the static image . . . col. 7, lines 20-23) . . .

As to claims 6 and 13, Watamoto teaches the method of claim 5, wherein assigning the image origin further comprises initially assigning the image origin for the static image to the display origin . . . col. 7, lines 20-23) . . .

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. In addition, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's characterization of Watamoto as disclosing the assigning of an image origin.

In paragraphs 6-7 of the Office Action, claims 2, 9 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watamoto in view of Falkman and U.S. Patent No. 5,900,851 (Toffolo). The Examiner cites Toffolo because "Toffolo teaches electroluminescent display panel 22." Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In paragraphs 8 and 9 of the Office Action, claims 4, 11 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watamoto in view of Falkman, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,369,851 (Marflak). The Examiner cites Marflak because "Marflak teaches a flat cathode ray tube." Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Falkman, Watamoto, Marflak and Toffolo are referred to below as the cited art.

To advance prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 15 to recite a feature related to the alteration of control data in the graphics engine. Previously presented independent claim 8 also recites that the graphics engine alters the control data. The altering of control data causes the static image to be substantially continuously moved. Accordingly, each of independent claims 1, 8, and 15 recites a feature related to the use of the graphics engine to adjust control data for achieving burn-in protection. Claim 1 specifically recites:

altering in the graphics engine the control data, substantially continuously, such that the drive signals are substantially continuously altered to thereby substantially continuously move the static image on the matrix in a manner which is substantially

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR002/KE

undetectable to viewers of the display device, wherein the control data is altered by redefining the image origin of the static image with respect to the display origin.

Claim 8 specifically recites:

wherein the graphics engine alters the control data, substantially continuously, such that the drive signals are substantially continuously altered to thereby substantially continuously move the static image on the matrix in a manner which is substantially undetectable to viewers of the display device.

Claim 15 specifically recites:

wherein the graphic means includes a graphic engine means for generating control data associated with the static image, the image having an image origin . . . wherein the graphic engine means redefines the image origin to move the static image.

Therefore, the present invention advantageously utilizes the graphics engine to alter control data for moving the static image. See present application, page 7, lines 1-3.

The rejection of independent claims 1, 8, and 15 is not proper because the rejection of these claims is based upon the combination of Watamoto and Falkman. The Examiner relies upon Falkman to teach the movement of the stationary image. However, Falkman does not move the stationary image by the technique explicitly recited in claims 1, 8 and 15. In particular, Falkman does not move the static image by using the graphics engine. Indeed, Falkman does not even mention control data created by the graphics engine for image movement. Rather, Falkman moves the image by delaying synchronizing signals through the use of multiplexer 188. See column 5, lines 27-40.

Delaying signals via a multiplexer is not the same as altering control data associated with the image in a graphics engine. Indeed, Falkman teaches away from the present invention by altering the image position in a display driver-type device associated with analog circuitry, rather than with the graphics engine. Watamoto, Toffolo and Marflak do not provide for the

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR002/KE

deficiencies associated with Falkman. Accordingly, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-7, independent claim 8 and its dependent claims 9-14, and independent claim 15 and its dependent claims 16-20 are patentable over the cited art.

In addition, independent claim 1, dependent claims 12-14 and independent claim 15 all recite features related to the definition of an image origin in the graphics engine. The origin is used to move the image according to the specific process of claims 1, 12-14 and 15. None of the cited art provides for the discussion of the particular technique for altering the control data utilizing an image origin as recited in independent claim 1, dependent claims 12-14 and independent claim 15.

The Examiner relies upon Watamoto for teaching the reassignment of an image origin and initially assigning the image origin to the display origin. However, Applicants' attorney is unable to determine where in Watamoto this is taught. The cited section of Watamoto merely states that "reproduction of a disk is discontinued when a motionless image is continuously displayed in a screen for a long period of time." However, this is not a discussion of image origin and the adjustment thereof. Falkman, Toffolo, and Marflak do not provide for the deficiencies of Watamoto. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-7, dependent claims 12-14 and independent claim 15 and its dependent claims 16-20 are additionally patentable over the cited art.

* * * *

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to

Atty. Dkt. No. 00CR002/KE

Deposit Account No. 18-1722. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 18-1722. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 18-1722.

Respectfully submitted,

Date 2/8/06

By Kyle Eppele

Rockwell Collins, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
400 Collins Road NE M/S 124-323
Cedar Rapids, IA 52498
Telephone No. (319) 295-8280
Facsimile No. (319) 295-8777
Customer No. 26383

Kyle Eppele
Attorney of Record
Reg. No. 34,155